



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

50

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/001,744      | 10/31/2001  | John Falk Kelley     | AUS920010748US1     | 2721             |

7590 03/24/2005

Robert H. Frantz  
P.O. Box 23324  
Oklahoma City, OK 73123-2334

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

TRUONG, CAM Y T

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2162

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/001,744

Applicant(s)

KELLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 in the amendment filed on 11/10/2004.

Claims 1-12 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's election with traverse of group I in the reply filed on 11/10/2004 is acknowledged. However, applicant did not provide any reason for the traverse of group

I. Thus, this is not found persuasive.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 7-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky et al (or hereinafter "Katinsky") (USP 6452609) in view of Madnick et al (or hereinafter "Madnick") (US 5913214).

Claims 1 and 7, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitations:

"displaying in a web page a Context Pane having one or more selectable objects of interest to a user" as displaying a media access web page 10 contains objects that can be selected by a user for viewing (fig. 1, col. 7, lines 15-20; col. 8, lines 50-65);

Art Unit: 2162

“displaying in said web page a plurality of selectable heterogeneous actions associated with an object and responsive to user selection of an associated object” as displaying in a web page a plurality of icons 60, 62, 64, 66, 68 and 69. These icon associated with media icons 30. In response user’s selection one of media icons 30, the system will display a detail information of this icon as shown in fig. 5. A plurality of icons are represented as a plurality of selectable heterogeneous actions. Each media icon is represented as media object (figs. 3A-4, col. 5, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 50-52);

“executing an action script in response to user selection of a selectable action, said action script generating a set of results” as the web page contains the program that displays controls, responds to user events. Thus, when a user selects one of media icons 30 in the sequence by clicking on it to make it the current media icon 52, the system has to execute an action program in response to user’s selection. A program is script (figs. 3A-4, col. 5, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 50-52);

“displaying in said web page to said user said action script results in a Content Pane” displaying a bulleted list containing bulleted items 26 after clicking on a subject matter tab 22 in content pane 12 (fig. 2A, col. 4, lines 30-35);

“said information being filtered and sorted according to said user’s interest as indicated by a most recent selection in said Context Pane” as (col. 2, lines 55-60; col. 8, lines 60-65; col. 9, lines 1-10).

Katinsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “said Content Pane containing an aggregation of semi-independent heterogeneous information modules, heterogeneous transactional modules, or both”

Madnick teaches that queries may access multiple data sources 104 in order to generate the answer for a user query. For example, a query may be broken down into multiple sub-queries, some of which access traditional databases, some of which access relational databases distributed over a network, and some of which access semi-structured data sources such as a Web page or a menu-driven database system. These sites are all accessed as described respectively above and the separate results are returned. The results from the semi-structured data sources distributed over the network are returned to the wrapper generator 614. The separate responses may be joined by the wrapper generator 614 or by the request translator 102 to provide the user with a complete response to the query. The above information shows that the system aggregates results from modules and transaction modules (col. 15, lines 24-40). Wecker teaches selectively displaying utilization data indicating a date and time of a most recent utilization by said user with respect to said additional unit of information within an information window within said display in response to a selection of said marker by a user of said data processing system, wherein said utilization data may be visually accessed by a user without display of said additional unit of information (col. 5, lines 30-37).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Madnick's teaching of aggregating results from different resources to Katinsky's system in order to retrieve data from semi-structured data sources corresponding to user's request and further to provide the most relevance results corresponding to user's request.

As to claims 2 and 8, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “performing a search for information related to said selected object” as after clicking on a tab or outline line in the new media icon access panel 12 generates an SQL query of the interface database 1012 which returns a record set containing the elements to be displayed and the format. This information implies that the system performs a search for records related to the tab or outline. A tab or outline in the new media icon is represented as an object (col. 11, lines 15-20).

As to claims 3 and 9, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “retrieving data or information from a database” as (col. 11, lines 15-20).

As to claims 4 and 10, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “the step of retrieving current data or information from a datafeed” as after clicking on a tab or outline line in the new media icon, access panel 12 generates an SQL query of the interface database 1012 which returns a record set containing the elements to be displayed and the format. This information implies that the system retrieves a record set containing the elements from database 1012 to display to a user (col. 11, lines 15-20).

As to claim 6, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “organizing said content pane into a plurality of selectable workspaces” as (figs. 2C-5).

As to claim 12, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “organizing said content pane into a plurality of selectable workspace” as (fig. 2A-2B; col. 4, lines 37-50).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky in view of Madnick and Wecker and further in view of Nikolovska (USP 6452609).

As to claims 5 and 11, Katinsky disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation “filtering and sorting said results prior to display”. Nikolovska teaches the user views and selects among the results of the search, which is a result of the sorting, filtering, and profiling information (col. 2, line 25-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Nikolovska’s teaching of using a text query to filter and sort records in its database representing entry points to WWW into Katinsky’s system in

Art Unit: 2162

order to eliminate irrelevant information and display results in a visually clear and simple way.

6. Claims 1-4, 6, 7-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky et al (or hereinafter "Katinsky") (USP 6452609) in view of Madnick et al (or hereinafter "Madnick") (US 5913214) and Wecker (US 5806077).

Claims 1 and 7, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitations:

"displaying in a web page a Context Pane having one or more selectable objects of interest to a user" as displaying a media access web page 10 contains objects that can be selected by a user for viewing (fig. 1, col. 7, lines 15-20; col. 8, lines 50-65);

"displaying in said web page a plurality of selectable heterogeneous actions associated with an object and responsive to user selection of an associated object" as displaying in a web page a plurality of icons 60, 62, 64, 66, 68 and 69. These icon associated with media icons 30. In response user's selection one of media icons 30, the system will display a detail information of this icon as shown in fig. 5. A plurality of icons are represented as a plurality of selectable heterogeneous actions. Each media icon is represented as media object (figs. 3A-4, col. 5, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 50-52);

"executing an action script in response to user selection of a selectable action, said action script generating a set of results" as the web page contains the program that displays controls, responds to user events. Thus, when a user selects one of media icons 30 in the sequence by clicking on it to make it the current media icon 52, the



Art Unit: 2162

system has to execute an action program in response to user's selection. A program is script (figs. 3A-4, col. 5, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 50-52);

"displaying in said web page to said user said action script results in a Content Pane" displaying a bulleted list containing bulleted items 26 after clicking on a subject matter tab 22 in content pane 12 (fig. 2A, col. 4, lines 30-35);

"said information being filtered and sorted according to said user's interest as indicated by a most recent selection in said Context Pane" as (col. 8, lines 60-65; col. 9, lines 1-10).

Katinsky does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "said Content Pane containing an aggregation of semi-independent heterogeneous information modules, heterogeneous transactional modules, or both; as indicated by a most recently selection in said Context Pane".

Madnick teaches that queries may access multiple data sources 104 in order to generate the answer for a user query. For example, a query may be broken down into multiple sub-queries, some of which access traditional databases, some of which access relational databases distributed over a network, and some of which access semi-structured data sources such as a Web page or a menu-driven database system. These sites are all accessed as described respectively above and the separate results are returned. The results from the semi-structured data sources distributed over the network are returned to the wrapper generator 614. The separate responses may be joined by the wrapper generator 614 or by the request translator 102 to provide the user with a complete response to the query. The above information

Art Unit: 2162

shows that the system aggregates results from modules and transaction modules (col. 15, lines 24-40). Wecker teaches selectively displaying utilization data indicating a date and time of a most recent utilization by said user with respect to said additional unit of information within an information window within said display in response to a selection of said marker by a user of said data processing system, wherein said utilization data may be visually accessed by a user without display of said additional unit of information (col. 5, lines 30-37).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Madnick's teaching of aggregating results from different resources and Wecker's teaching of selectively displaying utilization data indicating a date and time of a most recent utilization by said user with respect to said additional unit of information within an information window within said display in response to a selection of said marker by a user of said data processing system, wherein said utilization data may be visually accessed by a user without display of said additional unit of information to Katinsky's system in order to retrieve data from semi-structured data sources corresponding to user's request, to provide the most relevance results corresponding to user's request and further to display further information regarding previous visits to that unit of information via a predetermined user input operation a time when a display cursor is within the bondaries of the marker

As to claims 2 and 8, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “performing a search for information related to said selected object” as after clicking on a tab or outline line in the new media icon access panel 12 generates an SQL query of the interface database 1012 which returns a record set containing the elements to be displayed and the format. This information implies that the system performs a search for records related to the tab or outline. A tab or outline in the new media icon is represented as an object (col. 11, lines 15-20).

As to claims 3 and 9, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “retrieving data or information from a database” as (col. 11, lines 15-20).

As to claims 4 and 10, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “the step of retrieving current data or information from a datafeed” as after clicking on a tab or outline line in the new media icon, access panel 12 generates an SQL query of the interface database 1012 which returns a record set containing the elements to be displayed and the format. This information implies that the system retrieves a record set containing the elements from database 1012 to display to a user (col. 11, lines 15-20).

As to claim 6, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation “organizing said content pane into a plurality of selectable workspaces” as (figs. 2C-5).

Art Unit: 2162

As to claim 12, Katinsky teaches the claimed limitation "organizing said content pane into a plurality of selectable workspace" as (fig. 2A-2B; col. 4, lines 37-50).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky in view of Madnick and Wecker and further in view of Nikolovska (USP 6452609).

As to claims 5 and 11, Katinsky disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "filtering and sorting said results prior to display". Nikolovska teaches the user views and selects among the results of the search, which is a result of the sorting, filtering, and profiling information (col. 2, line 25-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Nikolovska's teaching of using a text query to filter and sort records in its database representing entry points to WWW into Katinsky's system, Wecker's system and Madnick's system in order to eliminate irrelevant information and display results in a visually clear and simple way.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


***Contact Information***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
3/14/2005

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER